

to 12 inches in diameter. In units with limited accessibility, trees up to 19.9 inches will be masticated. Black oak stump sprouts will be left untreated at an approximate spacing of 18–25 feet, with mastication in between. Fire-injured trees may be removed in order to meet post-fire fuels and operational objectives. Snags would be retained in snag retention areas, and in treatment areas at a minimum of 2 snags per acre and up to 4 snags per acre (exception is along the Rim Road, where either all snags would be removed or up to 2 snags per acre would be retained). Approximately 30 acres would be required for log and biomass landing activities. No new road construction would be required. Approximately 56 acres of fire-damaged plantations would be reforested and 40 acres of “spot planting” with conifer seedlings would occur in widely spaced clusters to emulate a naturally established forest. The areas would be reforested with a mixture of native species. In both burned and unburned areas, manual cutting of shrubs, trees 1 to 9 inches dbh, and/or thinning aggregations of 1 to 9 inches dbh conifers or plantation trees would occur.

Possible Alternatives

In addition to the proposed action, two other alternatives would be analyzed, a no action alternative (alternative A), and an action alternative consistent with the 2001 SNFPA ROD (alternative C).

Lead and Cooperating Agencies

The USDA, Forest Service is the lead agency for this proposal. The USDI, Bureau of Land Management is a cooperating agency for the purpose of this EIS.

Responsible Official

USDA Forest Service, Feather River District Ranger of the Plumas National Forest and the USDI Bureau of Land Management, Northern California Redding Field Manager are the Responsible Officials.

Nature of Decision To Be Made

The decision to be made is whether to: (1) Implement the proposed action; (2) meet the purpose and need for action through some other combination of activities; or, (3) take no action at this time.

Preliminary Issues

The proposed action may increase adverse effects to water and other aquatic dependent resources in municipal watersheds, already considered highly disturbed.

Specifically, implementing ground-disturbing activities in watersheds that are already over the threshold of concern may increase the risk of adverse and cumulative watershed effects. The proposed action may increase adverse cumulative loss of snag (post-fire dead tree) habitat, already depleted over roughly 8,000 acres in surrounding areas, along with the species that are dependent on them for nesting and roosting.

Permits or Licenses Required

An Air Pollution Permit and a Smoke Management Plan are required by local agencies.

Scoping Process

This notice of intent initiates the scoping process, which guides the development of the environmental impact statement. A public field trip will be held on October 10, 2009, starting at 9 a.m., leaving from the Pines Yankee Hill Hardware Store, 11 300A Highway 70, Oroville, CA 95965.

It is important that reviewers provide their comments at such times and in such a manner that they are useful to the agency's preparation of the environmental impact statement. Therefore, comments should be provided prior to the close of the comment period and should clearly articulate the reviewer's concerns and contentions. The submission of timely and specific comments can affect a reviewer's ability to participate in subsequent administrative appeal or judicial review.

Dated: September 14, 2009.

Karen L. Hayden,

Feather River District Ranger.

[FR Doc. E9–22952 Filed 9–23–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Limitations of Duty- and Quota-Free Imports of Apparel Articles Assembled in Beneficiary Sub-Saharan African Countries From Regional and Third-Country Fabric

September 21, 2009.

AGENCY: Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

ACTION: Publishing the New 12-Month Cap on Duty- and Quota-Free Benefits.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 1, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Don Niewiaroski, International Trade

Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482-4058.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: Title I, Section 112(b)(3) of the Trade and Development Act of 2000 (TDA 2000), P.L. 106-200, as amended by Division B, Title XXI, section 3108 of the Trade Act of 2002, P.L. 107-210; Section 7(b)(2) of the AGOA Acceleration Act of 2004, P.L. 108-274; Division D, Title VI, section 6002 of the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006 (TRHCA 2006), P.L. 109-432; Presidential Proclamation 7350 of October 2, 2000 (65 FR 59321); Presidential Proclamation 7626 of November 13, 2002 (67 FR 69459).

Title I of TDA 2000 provides for duty- and quota-free treatment for certain textile and apparel articles imported from designated beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries. Section 112(b)(3) of TDA 2000 provides duty- and quota-free treatment for apparel articles wholly assembled in one or more beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries from fabric wholly formed in one or more beneficiary countries from yarn originating in the U.S. or one or more beneficiary countries. This preferential treatment is also available for apparel articles assembled in one or more lesser-developed beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, regardless of the country of origin of the fabric used to make such articles, subject to quantitative limitation. Title VI of the TRHCA 2006 extended this special rule for lesser-developed countries through September 30, 2012.

The AGOA Acceleration Act of 2004 provides that the quantitative limitation for the twelve-month period beginning October 1, 2009 will be an amount not to exceed 7 percent of the aggregate square meter equivalents of all apparel articles imported into the United States in the preceding 12-month period for which data are available. See Section 112(b)(3)(A)(ii)(I) of TDA 2000, as amended by Section 7(b)(2)(B) of the AGOA Acceleration Act of 2004. Of this overall amount, apparel imported under the special rule for lesser-developed countries is limited to an amount not to exceed 3.5 percent of all apparel articles imported into the United States in the preceding 12-month period. See Section 112(b)(3)(B)(ii)(II) of TDA 2000, as amended by Section 6002(a) of TRHCA 2006. Presidential Proclamation 7350 of October 2, 2000 directed CITA to publish the aggregate quantity of imports allowed during each 12-month period in the **Federal Register**.

For the one-year period, beginning on October 1, 2009, and extending through September 30, 2010, the aggregate quantity of imports eligible for preferential treatment under these

provisions is 1,628,793,037 square meters equivalent. Of this amount, 814,396,518 square meters equivalent is available to apparel articles imported under the special rule for lesser-developed countries. Apparel articles entered in excess of these quantities will be subject to otherwise applicable tariffs.

These quantities are calculated using the aggregate square meter equivalents of all apparel articles imported into the United States, derived from the set of Harmonized System lines listed in the Annex to the World Trade Organization Agreement on Textiles and Clothing (ATC), and the conversion factors for units of measure into square meter equivalents used by the United States in implementing the ATC.

Kimberly Glas,

Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc. E9-23118 Filed 9-23-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) will submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Agency: United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO).

Title: Invention Promoters/Promotion Firms Complaints.

Form Number(s): PTO/SB/2048.

Agency Approval Number: 0651-0044.

Type of Request: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Burden: 38 hours annually.

Number of Respondents: 100 responses per year.

Avg. Hours per Response: The USPTO estimates that it will take the public approximately 15 minutes (0.25 hours) to gather the necessary information, prepare the form, and submit a complaint to the USPTO and approximately 30 minutes (0.5 hours) for an invention promoter or promotion firm to prepare and submit a response to a complaint.

Needs and Uses: The Inventors' Rights Act of 1999 requires the USPTO to provide a forum for the publication of complaints concerning invention promoters and responses from the invention promoters to these

complaints. An individual may submit a complaint to the USPTO, which will then forward the complaint to the identified invention promoter for response. The complaints and responses are published on the USPTO Web site. The public uses this information collection to submit a complaint to the USPTO regarding an invention promoter or to respond to a complaint. The USPTO uses this information to comply with its statutory duty to publish the complaint along with any response from the invention promoter. The USPTO does not investigate these complaints or participate in any legal proceedings against invention promoters or promotion firms.

Affected Public: Individuals or households, businesses or other for-profits, and not-for-profit institutions.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

OMB Desk Officer: Nicholas A. Fraser, e-mail:

Nicholas_A_Fraser@omb.eop.gov.

Once submitted, the request will be publicly available in electronic format through the Information Collection Review page at <http://www.reginfo.gov>.

Paper copies can be obtained by:

- *E-mail:* Susan.Fawcett@uspto.gov. Include "0651-0044 Invention Promoters Complaints copy request" in the subject line of the message.

- *Fax:* 571-273-0112, marked to the attention of Susan K. Fawcett.

- *Mail:* Susan K. Fawcett, Records Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Administrative Management Group, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent on or before October 26, 2009 to Nicholas A. Fraser, OMB Desk Officer, via e-mail at Nicholas_A_Fraser@omb.eop.gov, or by fax to 202-395-5167, marked to the attention of Nicholas A. Fraser.

Dated: September 17, 2009.

Susan K. Fawcett,

Records Officer, USPTO, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Administrative Management Group.

[FR Doc. E9-23033 Filed 9-23-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-16-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

(A-421-811)

Purified Carboxymethylcellulose From the Netherlands; Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 24, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patrick Edwards, Brian Davis, or Angelica Mendoza, AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-8029, (202) 482-7924, or (202) 482-3019, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on purified carboxymethylcellulose (CMC) from the Netherlands on August 26, 2008. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 73 FR 50308 (August 26, 2008).¹ On May 26, 2009, the Department published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order covering purified CMC from the Netherlands. *See Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from the Netherlands; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 74 FR 24823 (May 26, 2009) (*Preliminary Results*). In the *Preliminary Results*, we invited parties to comment. In response, CP Kelco submitted a case brief and a request for a public hearing on June 26, 2009. *See Case Brief from Arent Fox LLP (counsel for respondent) titled "Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from the Netherlands; Case Brief of CP Kelco B.V.,"* dated June 26, 2009 (Case Brief). Petitioner submitted comments on June 30, 2009. *See Letter from Haynes & Boone, LLP (counsel for petitioner), titled "Comment by Petitioner Aqualon Company in Lieu of*

¹ On October 9, and October 10, 2008, respectively, Akzo Nobel Functional Chemicals B.V. (Akzo Nobel) and the Aqualon Company, a division of Hercules, Incorporated (petitioner), withdrew their requests for review of Akzo Nobel's sales of merchandise covered by the order. Therefore, the Department rescinded the review with respect to Akzo Nobel. *See Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from the Netherlands; Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 66841 (November 12, 2008).